

ALBUQUERQUE EVENING HERALD

TRIBUNE CITIZEN.
VOL. 26, NO. 56.

ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO, MONDAY, MAY 1, 1911.

EVENING HERALD
VOL. 1, NO. 18.

OHIO LEGISLATURE HAS SCANDAL THAT IS WORST IN ITS HISTORY

Detectives Declare They Have Dug Up Wholesale Bribery and Members Are Flocking Into Columbus Today.

THREE MEN ARRESTED WHO ADMIT CHARGES

They Declare They Bought and Paid for Votes of Legislators and Stenographers Took Notes of Talk.

(By Evening Herald A. P. Leased Wire) Columbus, May 1.—Members of the legislature flocked into the city early today because of the charges made by detectives who have been here for weeks, secretly investigating legislative bribery; that they have unearthed the worst scandal in the history of the Ohio general assembly.

Three detectives, E. S. Harrison of New York and A. C. Bailey and David Berry of Chicago, were arraigned in police court for alleged bribery of Representatives George H. Nye, and held to the grand jury.

The arrested men were employed by the Manufacturers' association and admit they offered and paid bribes to gain evidence against assemblymen.

"We have stenographic copies of every word that passed between Representative Nye and the other men involved in this matter," said Detective Harrison today. "Twenty members of the legislature are involved in this scandal. If I had been here a week longer I would have run out of names; they were so eager for it. It will take us a week to tell all we know found out."

There will be no legislative investigation of the bribery charges at least for the present.

The investigation will be made by the Franklin county grand jury. The reason is stated to be that this method will prevent members of the legislature under suspicion from testifying through an unsworn ballot.

FORFEITS HIS BOND FOR NON-APPEARANCE

Tuck Hing, Absconded Chinaman, Has Not Yet Shown Up and His Bondsmen Are Getting Auctions. \$1,000 Forfeited.

Phoenix, Ariz., May 1.—Tuck Hing, still largely undeniably a felon in the eyes of the law, is known about his whereabouts than was known about the whereabouts of the celebrated Dr. Cook just after his death pole story blew up. So far as anybody seems able to say, Tuck has not been seen in Phoenix since his departure.

Of course Tuck may not have skipped. There are people who seem he hasn't—particularly the sureties on his bond. But if he has, it will be up to them to make good a thousand dollars under which he was held.

Judge Kent yesterday evening rejected the motion when Assistant Hing failed to appear in court when his name was called.

LOS ANGELES STRIKE OF CARPENTERS ON

About 500 Men Walk Out to Enforce Demand for \$4 a Day Instead of Present Scale of \$3.50.

(By Evening Herald A. P. Leased Wire) Los Angeles, Calif., May 1.—The first of the scatious strikes of union labor men in this city was begun today when a general walk-out of all union carpenters was ordered to enforce a demand for a daily wage of \$4 instead of the present pay of \$3.50. About 500 carpenters quit work. Union leaders deny that there is any intention to call a general strike in Los Angeles at the present time.

CITY AND COUNTY WILL UNITE GOVERNMENTS

Consolidation of Denver Is Upheld by Supreme Court of Colorado in Opinion Rendered Today.

Denver, May 1.—The consolidation of the city and county of Denver governments is upheld in an opinion handed down today by the supreme court of Colorado.

The saving to the county, it is said, will reach several thousand dollars annually.

NO DECISIONS RENDERED IN BIG TRUST CASES

Washington, May 1.—The United States supreme court did not announce a decision today in either the Standard Oil or Tobacco suits arising under the Sherman antitrust law.

LEGAL BATTERIES ARE AWAITED IN FIGHT TO SAVE M'NAMARAS

Neither Side Is Making Move in Impending Battle for Freedom of Men Accused of Dynamiting in Los Angeles.

BIG LABOR LEADERS ARRIVE ON SCENE

(By Evening Herald A. P. Leased Wire) Los Angeles, May 1.—Although important legal developments were expected soon in the cases of John J. McNamee, secretary of the International Association of Bridge and Structural Iron Workers, and his brother, James G. McNamee, charged with dynamiting outrages, no further plans of either the prosecution or the defense were definitely announced today and both sides seemed waiting for attorneys before taking any formal legal step. No date was fixed definitely for the arraignment of the men, but it is known to which judge of the superior court their cases would be allotted.

District Attorney Fredericks is not expected to ask for the arraignments before the arrival about the middle of the present week of his assistant, W. Jessie Ford, from Indianapolis.

The defense is awaiting the arrival here of Clarence Darroch of Chicago or some of his representatives. Andrew J. Gallagher and H. E. Rosenblatt, labor leaders of San Francisco, have come here to confer with attorney of Los Angeles regarding the charges against the McNamees.

ALBUQUERQUE HAS BUT THIRTY ONE MANUFACTURES

Sixty-Seven Salaried Officers and 587 Employees Within City Limits: Plants Not Included.

(Evening Herald Bureau 14 Post Building 1 Washington, D. C.)

Washington, D. C., May 1.—A preliminary statement of the general results of the Thorough Census of Manufactures for the year 1909 of the city of Albuquerque, New Mexico, was issued today by Census Director Durand, as prepared under the direction of Mr. William M. Steiger, chief statistician for manufactures, bureau of census.

The figures are preliminary and subject to such revision as may be necessary after a further examination of original reports.

The value of products represents their selling value or price at the plants as actually turned out by the factories during the census year, and does not necessarily have any relation to the amount of sales for that year. The values under this head also include the amount received for work done on materials furnished by others.

The details can be drawn from the tabular summary which follows:

Number of establishments... 32

Capital... \$47,000

Cost of materials used... \$41,000

Salaries and wages... \$46,000

Miscellaneous expenses... 7,000

Value of products... \$288,000

Value added by manufacturer (products less cost of materials)... 70,000

Number of salaried officials and clerks... 67

Average number of wage earners employed during the year... 567

Several large manufacturing plants outside the limits of Albuquerque city are not included in the above compilation.

MULTI-MILLIONAIRE IS ON TRIAL FOR SANITY

Silas Hutchins, Who Promoted Linotype Machine and Owned Many Newspapers Is Mentally Unsound.

Washington, May 1.—A petition has been filed in the St. Louis Circuit Court to have Silas Hutchins, founder of the St. Louis Times, Washington Post, Washington Times and once prominent contractor with the Des Moines, Ia., State Journal, Des Moines Herald and St. Louis Dispatch, was admitted here today by the court being reasonable.

Mr. Hutchins is a multi-millionaire and has an organization and child promoter of the Morgan-Hanmer trust.

NO DECISIONS RENDERED IN BIG TRUST CASES

Washington, May 1.—The United States supreme court did not announce a decision today in either the Standard Oil or Tobacco suits arising under the Sherman antitrust law.

FOREST RESERVE IS CORRAL

ARE AWAITED IN FIGHT TO SAVE M'NAMARAS

LEGAL DECLARES U. S. SUPREME COURT TODAY

Fencing Laws Are Not Applicable There

Matter Came Up in Circuit Courts in Colorado and the Present Action Is in Nature of Test of Law.

(By Evening Herald A. P. Leased Wire) Washington, May 1.—Very important legal developments were expected soon in the cases of John J. McNamee, secretary of the International Association of Bridge and Structural Iron Workers, and his brother, James G. McNamee, charged with dynamiting outrages, no further plans of either the prosecution or the defense were definitely announced today and both sides seemed waiting for attorneys before taking any formal legal step. No date was fixed definitely for the arraignment of the men, but it is known to which judge of the superior court their cases would be allotted.

District Attorney Fredericks is not expected to ask for the arraignments before the arrival about the middle of the present week of his assistant, W. Jessie Ford, from Indianapolis.

The defense is awaiting the arrival here of Clarence Darroch of Chicago or some of his representatives. Andrew J. Gallagher and H. E. Rosenblatt, labor leaders of San Francisco, have come here to confer with attorney of Los Angeles regarding the charges against the McNamees.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

Therefore Light pointed to this law as barring the government from setting up a fence.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed out that the service had not been fenced in by the government and a Colorado law provided that no person should receive damages for trespass unless the land was fenced.

The defense met the government with several arguments. In the first place, it was pointed